



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,841	09/13/2006	Richard John Sciotti	PC32216A	1118
28880	7590	07/10/2008	EXAMINER	
PFIZER INC. PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611 GROTON, CT 06340			MOORE, SUSANNA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

~IPGSGro@pfizer.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/598,841	Applicant(s) SCIOTTI ET AL.	
	Examiner SUSANNA MOORE	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2, 10, 12 and 13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 5-9 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/13/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 6/9/2008 is acknowledged. Group I, drawn to imidazo[1,2-a]pyridines and simple compositions thereof, embraced by claims 1, 3-9 and 11 was elected by Applicant. Applicant has not pointed to any errors in the Examiner's analysis of the classification of the different inventions. The requirement is deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

There are 13 claims pending and 9 under consideration. Claims 1 and 3-9 are compound claims. Claim 11 is a composition claim. Claims 2, 10 and 12-13 are drawn to nonelected subject matter or nonstatutory claims, which are currently withdrawn from consideration. This is the first action on the merits. The application concerns some imidazo[1,2-a]pyridine compounds and simple compositions thereof.

Priority

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Substituted Imidazo[1,2-a]pyridines as Antibacterial Agents.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/13/06 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

This application contains claims 2, 12 and 13, drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the paper of 6/9/2008. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144). See MPEP § 821.01.

Claims 1 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities: the term “heterocylco” should be replaced with “heterocyclyl” in claim 1, page 91, lines 1, 8 and 26; and claim 4, page 92, lines 5 and 11, page 93, line 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 5-8 and 11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 5-8 and 11 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term “morpholine” should be replaced with “morpholinyl” on page 95, the 12th specie from the bottom of the page. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term “and” on page 94, line 24 and the phrase “compound with” on page 95, line 18 should be removed. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds of Formula 1, wherein $X^1 = \text{NH}$ and O ; $X^2 =$ absent; $R^3 = (\text{C}_1\text{-C}_6)\text{alkyl}$, heteroaryl, $\text{C}(\text{O})\text{NRaRb}$, $\text{C}(\text{O})\text{Ra}$ does not reasonably provide enablement for compounds of Formula 1, wherein $X^1 = \text{CH}_2$; $X^2 = \text{NH}$, O , $(\text{CH}_2)_x$ cyclopropyl with various points of attachment, or a tether as illustrated in claim 1; $R^3 = (\text{C}_3\text{-C}_6)\text{cycloalkyl}$, aryl, heterocyclo, CO_2Ra , $\text{C}(\text{O})\text{C}(\text{O})\text{NRaRb}$, NO_2 , SO_2Ra , SO_2NRaRb , $\text{C}(\text{Rc})=\text{NORa}$, $\text{C}(\text{Rc})=\text{NRa}$, $\text{C}=\text{N-NRaRb}$, $\text{C}=\text{N-NC}(\text{O})\text{Rc}$. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Pursuant to *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731,737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), one considers the following factors to determine whether undue experimentation is required: (A) The breadth of the claims; (B) The nature of the invention; (C) The state of the prior art; (D) The level of one of ordinary skill; (E) The level of predictability in the art; (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor; (G) The existence of working examples; and (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. Some experimentation is not fatal; the issue is whether the amount of experimentation is "undue"; see *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1444.

The analysis is as follows:

(A) Breadth of claims: Scope of the compounds. Owing to the range of many variables, trillions of substituted imidazo[1,2-a]pyrimidines are embraced.

(B) The nature of the invention: The invention is a highly substituted imidazo[1,2-a]pyrimidines.

(C) Level of predictability in the art: It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved," and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

(D) Direction or Guidance: That provided is very limited. Applicant shows a general synthesis of compounds of Formula 1, under Preparation on pages 23-27 of the Specification, but does not show the starting material used to make the variety of compounds claimed. There is limited evidence in the Specification of the example compounds that only cover a small portion of the substituents claimed of Formula 1. Thus, there is no specific direction or guidance regarding said compounds of Formula 1 specifically mentioned in Scope.

The specification does not provide any support for the synthesis of compounds of Formula 1, wherein $X^1 = CH_2$; $X^2 = NH, O, (CH_2)_x$ cyclopropyl with various points of attachment, or a tether as illustrated in claim 1; $R^3 = (C_3-C_6)$ cycloalkyl, aryl, heterocyclo, CO_2Ra , $C(O)C(O)NRaRb$, NO_2 , SO_2Ra , SO_2NRaRb , $C(Rc)=NORa$, $C(Rc)=NRa$, $C=N-NRaRb$, $C=N-NC(O)Rc$.

The availability of the starting material that is needed to prepare the invention as claimed is at issue here...As per MPEP 21'64.01 (b). A key issue that can arise when determining whether the specification is enabling is whether the starting materials or apparatus necessary to make the invention are available. In the biotechnical area, this is often true when the product or process requires a particular strain of microorganism and when the microorganism is available only after extensive screening. The Court in *In re Ghiron*, 442 F.2d 985, 991, 169 USPQ 723, 727 (CCPA 1971), made it clear that if the practice of a method requires a particular apparatus, the application must provide a sufficient disclosure of the apparatus if the apparatus is not readily available. The same can be said if certain chemicals are required to make a compound or practice a chemical process. *In re Howarth*, 654 F.2d 103, 105, 210 USPQ 689, 691 (CCPA 1981).

Art Unit: 1624

(E) State of the Prior Art: These compounds are substituted imidazo[1,2-a]pyrimidines of Formula I wherein $X^1 = \text{NH}$ and O ; $X^2 = \text{absent}$; $R^3 = (\text{C}_1\text{-C}_6)\text{alkyl}$, heteroaryl, $\text{C}(\text{O})\text{NRaRb}$, $\text{C}(\text{O})\text{Ra}$ which are well documented in the art. So far as the examiner is aware, no substituted imidazo[1,2-a]pyrimidines of Formula I wherein $X^1 = \text{CH}_2$; $X^2 = \text{NH}$, O , $(\text{CH}_2)_x$ cyclopropyl with various points of attachment, or a tether as illustrated in claim 1; $R^3 = (\text{C}_3\text{-C}_6)\text{cycloalkyl}$, aryl, heterocyclo, CO_2Ra , $\text{C}(\text{O})\text{C}(\text{O})\text{NRaRb}$, NO_2 , SO_2Ra , SO_2NRaRb , $\text{C}(\text{Rc})=\text{NORa}$, $\text{C}(\text{Rc})=\text{NRa}$, $\text{C}=\text{N-NRaRb}$, $\text{C}=\text{N-NC}(\text{O})\text{Rc}$ of any kind have been made or used.

(F) Working Examples: Applicant shows example 1-51 but no working examples were shown of Formula I wherein $X^1 = \text{CH}_2$; $X^2 = \text{NH}$, O , $(\text{CH}_2)_x$ cyclopropyl with various points of attachment, or a tether as illustrated in claim 1; $R^3 = (\text{C}_3\text{-C}_6)\text{cycloalkyl}$, aryl, heterocyclo, CO_2Ra , $\text{C}(\text{O})\text{C}(\text{O})\text{NRaRb}$, NO_2 , SO_2Ra , SO_2NRaRb , $\text{C}(\text{Rc})=\text{NORa}$, $\text{C}(\text{Rc})=\text{NRa}$, $\text{C}=\text{N-NRaRb}$, $\text{C}=\text{N-NC}(\text{O})\text{Rc}$ of any kind have been made or used.

(G) Skill of those in the art: The ordinary artisan is highly skilled.

(H) The quantity of experimentation needed: Since there are very limited working examples as described above, the amount of experimentation is expected to be high and burdensome.

Due to the level of unpredictability in the art, the very limited guidance provide, and the lack of working examples, the Applicant has shown lack of enablement for the groups noted groups on Formula i. MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that,

Art Unit: 1624

based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSANNA MOORE whose telephone number is (571)272-9046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susanna Moore/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

/Brenda L. Coleman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624